



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/885,076 | 06/21/2001 | Kevin Wade Jameson | | 3817 |

29684 7590 11/12/2004
KEVIN JAMESON
148 EDGEBANK PLACE NW
CALGARY, AB T3A 4L4
CANADA

EXAMINER

HOLMES, MICHAEL B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2121

DATE MAILED: 11/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/885,076

Applicant(s)

JAMESON, KEVIN WADE

Examiner

Michael B. Holmes

Art Unit

2121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE (3) MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 9-13 and 17-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 7, 14-16 and 22-24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 June 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 – www.USPTO.GOV

Examiner's Detailed Office Action

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is responsive to communication received on August 09, 2004, Amendment under 37 CFR § 1.111. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application 09/885,076 filed June 21, 2004 is respectfully requested by applicant. All such supporting documentation has been placed in applicant's file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an

Art Unit: 2121

international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. **Claims 1-5, 9-13, & 17-21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Ranger (USPN 6,301,584 B1), Filed: Aug. 21, 1998; Date of Patent: Oct. 09, 2001.**

Regarding claim 1, 9, & 17:

Ranger teaches,

A collection content classifier process for producing classification information for collections, to be performed on or with the aid of a programmable device, comprising the following steps:

(a) determining collection membership information for a collection being processed, [(col. 5, line 43-51 “Each web server implementation of the present invention includes an information “metamodel” for information discovery, modeling, and visualization. A metamodel is a structured, generic model used as a framework for implementing specific information models, examples of which are illustrated in FIGS. 7, 8, 9. Referring to FIG. 3, depicted is one data structure of a general-purpose information metamodel 200 for defining and configuring the information models and visual representations stored at a server.”)] and

(b) making said collection membership information available for use by software programs, [(col. 5, line 52 to col. 06, line 05 “Information metamodel 200 is a way of generically organizing information about specific information models. Accordingly, data structures for information metamodel 200 define a set of data types, describing how classes of the information model are defined, how objects in the information model are instantiated, and how objects are

Art Unit: 2121

displayed. According to one embodiment, the data structures for information metamodel 200 are implemented within a relational database. Each data type in the information metamodel 200 corresponds to a table in the relational database, each instance of a data type is stored as a row or "entry" in a table corresponding to the type, and the fields of each data type correspond to columns in the corresponding table. Persons of skill in the art would readily recognize that the information metamodel 200 may be implemented in a variety of ways other than with a relational database, for example, by a collection of persistent objects defined with an object-oriented language such as C++, Smalltalk, and Java, or files of records or structures of a procedural language such as C, Pascal, Ada, BASIC, FORTRAN, COBOL, PL/I, and the like.")]

wherein collections are data structures comprised of a collection specifier and collection content containing zero or more collection content files, and wherein a collection specifier contains information about a collection instance, and wherein collection membership information describes collection content, thereby providing a solution to the collection content membership problem, and thereby enabling application programs to determine collection membership information in an automated, scalable way that was not previously available. [Automatic

Content Classification (col. 22, line 38 to col. 23, line 34 *"In the course of information discovery it is possible for the web server to find a large number of content items in response to a query from a user. For example, queries supplied to the system may lead in a large number of entities to be retrieved and presented to the user. With known systems, the user would be confronted with long lists of results, in particular hyperlinks, to scroll through. Accordingly, one embodiment of the present invention relates to supplying the results of a query input by the user in a more structured manner, by performing automatic content classification of an object's*

content items for visualization. Automatic classification places each item into a particular bin for each of several possible classification criteria. In this manner, the web server automatically performs a "hit analysis" of the query results so that the user can more easily ascertain by browsing to a relevant bin for items that are most relevant to the user. One embodiment takes advantage of the fact that the retrieved entities are dedicated to a structured model and thus that it has some understanding of entities. It is thus possible to organize long lists of entities. All entities belong to a class with defined properties. Using that knowledge, the embodiment takes a long list and splits into smaller lists. Each smaller list represents entities falling within some range for a property value. For example, for a big list of Employees, the system could break the list down according to employee ID. A first sub-list would contain references to employees with IDs less than 236 and the other smaller list would contain references to employees with IDs greater than 342. This example is illustrated in FIG. 11. Since there is more than one property definition that can be used to create smaller lists, the system offers alternate subdivisions of the oversized content. This is in particular performed for each of the property values that may be viewed by the user. As illustrated in FIG. 11, smaller lists are created for the first name, last name, city and state. If the smaller sub-list is still too large for comfort, the system applies the same operation again on the sub-list, until the user reaches a list small enough to be laid out in full. This is performed automatically for example by assigning to the system a predetermined maximum number of entities that the sub-list may not be exceeded. Sometimes the amount of data that would be returned by an agent is so large that the system can only accept some of it from the data source and must discard the rest. For example, an agent could return a million references to Customers. The manageable portion that is accepted by the system is displayed

Art Unit: 2121

using the same technique. As the user accesses restricted subsets of the original list, a more specific query is sent, yielding a smaller number of references. If the that smaller number, for example 100,000, is still be too large, then this technique is reapplied. Eventually though, when the user has navigated to a narrow enough subset, the highly constrained query will return a complete yet manageable set of answers which can all be accepted and displayed by the system according to the present invention. Consequently, such a subdivision of the results or automatic content classification provides a logical structure of the retrieved entities to the user, wherein the user can select a range. It should be noted that this provision could also be applied in other systems, in particular in systems without mutation, and in general to any displaying system for displaying large sets of data.”]

Regarding claim 2, 10, & 18:

Ranger teaches,

The process, programmable device, computer readable memory of claims 1, 9, & 17 wherein:

(a) said step of determining collection membership information uses collection multiple product specification information; thereby providing a solution to the collection multiple product problem, and thereby enabling application programs to determine collection membership information for multiple collection products in an automated, scalable way that was not previously available. **[FIG. 2;** (“*FIG. 2 shows an alternative configuration of data discovery, integration, and visualization system 100 for retrieving entities within a computer network, in which a plurality of data sources are stored. The retrieved entities may be represented to a plurality of users at respective personal computers 240 with a user interface, in particular a web*

Art Unit: 2121

browser. The personal computers 240 are coupled, through network 122 to a network computer 126, acting as a web server and enabling a connection to the Internet 128. The network computer 126 comprises memory 105 into which several databases are stored, for example spreadsheets 242, internal web sites 244 or other databases 246. External data source formats may include external databases 257, telnet sites 267, and public web sites 277, stored in respective memories 255, 265 and 275 in respective computer systems 250, 260, 270. According to other embodiments, the internal and external data sources include video or sound. Entity retrieving system 100 can retrieve entities stored in data sources with different formats, as described hereinafter.”]

Regarding claim 3, 11, & 19:

Ranger teaches,

The process, programmable device, computer readable memory of claims 1, 9, & 17 wherein:

(a) said step of determining collection membership information uses collection special fileset specification information, thereby providing a solution to the collection special fileset problem, and thereby enabling application programs to determine collection membership information for collection special filesets in an automated, scalable way that was not previously available.

[FIG. 2; (“FIG. 2 shows an alternative configuration of data discovery, integration, and visualization system 100 for retrieving entities within a computer network, in which a plurality of data sources are stored. The retrieved entities may be represented to a plurality of users at respective personal computers 240 with a user interface, in particular a web browser. The personal computers 240 are coupled, through network 122 to a network computer 126, acting

Art Unit: 2121

as a web server and enabling a connection to the Internet 128. The network computer 126 comprises memory 105 into which several databases are stored, for example spreadsheets 242, internal web sites 244 or other databases 246. External data source formats may include external databases 257, telnet sites 267, and public web sites 277, stored in respective memories 255, 265 and 275 in respective computer systems 250, 260, 270. According to other embodiments, the internal and external data sources include video or sound. Entity retrieving system 100 can retrieve entities stored in data sources with different formats, as described hereinafter.”]]

Regarding claim 4, 12, & 20:

Ranger teaches,

The process, programmable device, computer readable memory of claims 1, 9, & 17 wherein:

(a) said step of determining collection membership information uses one or more collection content control directives, thereby providing an enhanced solution for the collection content membership problem that accommodates external collection content and provides precise mechanisms for overriding collection specifier and type definition information, and thereby enabling application programs to determine collection membership information that involves external collection content, in an automated, scalable way that was not previously available. [(col. 6, line 06-23 “In accordance with one embodiment, FIG. 3 shows a number of data types, each data type having a number of fields, and each field defining a certain function. Many to one relationships between the fields are indicated by interconnecting lines with an indication “.infin.” on the many side and “1” on the one side. For example, an instance (an

Art Unit: 2121

object of data type Instance 215) may have many attributes 211. Accordingly, there is an indication ".infin." on the many side of the Instance field 211-1 and an indication "1" on the one side of the Instance field 215-1. Closely related data types defined by information metamodel 200 are grouped in three related layers: a data layer 210, a conceptual layer 220, and a visualization layer 230. The conceptual layer 220 acts as an intermediary between the data layer 210 and the visualization layer 230 and comprises data types that describe how information is organized within a defined information model.")]

Regarding claim 5, 13, & 21:

Ranger teaches,

The process, programmable device, computer readable memory of claims 1, 9, & 17 wherein:

(a) said step of determining collection membership information uses information selected from the group consisting of collection type definition information and collection product type definition information and collection content type definition information, thereby providing human administrators with a means for conveniently implementing and customizing administrative classification policies that are used by collection content classifiers. [col. 5, line 8-21 ("Referring to FIG. 2, depicted is a network 200 within which the present invention may be implemented. A web server 220 according to one embodiment of the present invention gathers information dynamically from one or more data sources, which may be located at different servers and have incompatible formats, structures the information into an object-oriented, information model, and outputs the information for the user according to an associated visual representation. The information model and the visual representation are defined by

Art Unit: 2121

human operators according to their own needs, purposes, and preferences as part of the configuration of the server. Multiple information models and visual representations may be defined for any server.”]]

Claim Objection(s)

5. Claims 6-7, 14-16, & 22-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

6 Applicant’s remarks, there were none. Applicant failed to respond the prior Office Action. Therefore, the prior rejections stands. Applicant is a pro se, and thus, the examiner will attempt to contact applicant and offer any assistance he can.

Examiners Summary

7 Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH**

Art Unit: 2121

shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Correspondence Information

8. Any inquires concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Michael B. Holmes**, who may be reached Monday through Friday, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. EST. or via telephone at **(571) 272-3686** or facsimile transmission **(571) 273-3686** or email Michael.holmesb@uspto.gov.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful the **Examiner's Supervisor**, **Anthony Knight**, may be reached at **(571) 272-3687**.

Michael B. Holmes

Patent Examiner

Artificial Intelligence

Art Unit 2121

United States Department of Commerce

Patent & Trademark Office



Anthony Knight

Supervisory Patent Examiner

Group 3600